

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

### **35 U.S.C CLAIM §112 REJECTION**

**35 U.S.C. §102(e) REJECTION**

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(e) rejection.

## OVERVIEW

Throckmorton describes a system for receiving a video signal that is combined with a data signal and termed therein "associated data." The associated data is stored in memory for future use. The "associated data" is not interactive compatible data as recited by the Applicants. Throckmorton describes retrieving data from remote computers upon "human interface" command for presentation to a user at the "human interface." The data from remote computers is not interactive compatible data as recited by the Applicants, and is not received using the structure and method as recited by the Applicants

Harrison describes a system for receiving a video signal that is combined with a data signal and termed therein "associated data." The associated data is not interactive compatible data as recited by the Applicants. The associated data consists of chat data to be displayed on a separate window from the video. Harrison describes that the associated chat data is replaced by chat data from a chat in which the user participates, in response to an input at a keyboard. The chat in which the user participates is not interactive compatible data as recited by the Applicants, and is not received using the structure and method as recited by the Applicants

Neither Throckmorton nor Harrison anticipate determining whether a program is interactive compatible, and retrieving the video interactive program with the structure and method recited by the Applicants. The system described in Throckmorton and Harrison describes data and that happens to enter their systems in association with a television signal. Throckmorton and Harrison also describe receiving other data for display or storage that is not interactive television data and that is without the details of structure and method recited by Applicants. Either

1 expressly or inherently, the claim elements recited by the Applicants is not present  
2 in Throckmorton and in Harrison.

3  
4 **THE THROCKMORTON 35 U.S.C. §102(e) REJECTION**

5 **Claim 56**

6 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
7 claim 56 because claim 56 includes at least three elements not described in  
8 Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 56 recites a  
9 viewer computing unit comprising the following elements:

10  
11 1) a processor programmed to determine whether the video content  
12 programs are interactive, and (2) an Internet browser stored in  
13 memory and being dynamically loadable for execution on the  
14 processor (3) when the tuner is tuned to a channel carrying a video  
15 content program that is interactive.

16  
17 The Office Action contends that Throckmorton at col. 6 line 28 - col. 9 line  
18 15 inherently discloses Applicant's viewer computing unit as recited in claim 56.  
19 To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing  
20 descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described. Furthermore,  
21 inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. MPEP §2112  
22 from *In re Robertson*, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-52 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Applicants  
23 respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not inherently disclose Applicants'  
24 viewer computing unit as recited in claim 56.

1 Throckmorton (col. 6 line 28 - col. 9 line 15) describes a system for  
2 receiving and displaying both broadcast data (termed "primary data") and  
3 associated data. Throckmorton describes input video signal 50 that has a primary  
4 data stream portion and an associated data stream portion. These portions are  
5 combined by the synchronizer (col. 5 line 21-23). The system 34 separates this  
6 combined input signal into a primary data stream portion and an associated data  
7 stream portion without testing whether there is an interactive or even an associated  
8 content. Throckmorton describes a receiver 36 receiving an input signal that  
9 contains a combined primary data and associated data stream (col. 5 line 21-23,  
10 col. 6 line 7-8). The receiver 36 separates ("demodulates") the input signal into a  
11 separate primary data stream (path 52), and an associated data stream (path 56)  
12 (col. 6 line 30-35). The associated data stream passes through decoder 58 to  
13 decode the associated data from the delivery media (col. 6 line 50-51). A protocol  
14 manager 60 extracts the associated data from the data stream and converts the  
15 associated data into a form compatible with communications manager 66 (col. 6  
16 line 56-60).

17 Throckmorton also describes a local data manager 84 connected to both the  
18 communications manager 66 and a "human interface" 88. The local data manager  
19 receives commands from the "human interface" to retrieve associated data from  
20 local storage 80 for presentation, a browser "may be used to display data pages  
21 from the WWW" (col. 7 line 36 - line 44). Throckmorton describes that a remote  
22 data manager 92 receives commands from the "human interface" 88 to retrieve  
23 data from remote computers through communications channel 74, and send that  
24 data for presentation to the "human interface" 88 (col. 8 line 30-34).  
25 Communications channel 74 (FIG. 5) "provides the functions of connecting the

1 client system interactively to remote computers” (col. 9 line 53-57), and the “two-  
2 way communication channel allows a consumer to access online services” which  
3 may be web pages” (col. 9 line 1-4).

4 Applicants’ element (1) a processor “programmed to determine whether the  
5 video content programs are interactive” is not expressly or inherently present in  
6 the system described in Throckmorton. There is not a structure described in  
7 Throckmorton expressly or inherently to determine whether a video program is  
8 interactive. The structure described in Throckmorton instead assumes that a video  
9 signal has an associated (not an interactive) component that is input with the video  
10 signal. The associated data stream portion in Throckmorton is specifically not  
11 related to an interactive (col. 4 line 6-line 13) television program. With reference  
12 to the cited FIG. 3, a user nowhere interacts with the associated data, but instead  
13 views it (col. 7 line 38-41). Throckmorton does not take any action depending  
14 upon whether there is an interactive or even an associated data portion. With  
15 reference to the Communication channel 74 providing “the functions of  
16 connecting the client system interactively to remote computers,” and the “two-way  
17 communication channel allow[ing] a consumer to access online services” (col. 9  
18 line 1-4) termed “interactive” here, does not mean that a video program is  
19 interactive but only that a connection between the client system and the remote  
20 computer is interactive. Moreover, this connection with remote computers is  
21 expressly stated in Throckmorton as being initiated by a “human interface” and  
22 therefore not a result of a “processor programmed to determine whether the video  
23 content programs are interactive” as recited by Applicants.

24 Applicants’ element (2) “Internet browser that is stored in memory, and  
25 dynamically loadable for execution on the processor” is not expressly or

1 inherently present in the system described in Throckmorton. Throckmorton  
2 merely states that a Web Browser may be used to display pages from the WWW in  
3 response to a command from the human interface 88 (Col. 7 Line 35-44).  
4 Throckmorton mention the word "browser" only in this last reference and nowhere  
5 states or describes that the Internet browser is dynamically loadable.  
6 Throckmorton does not describe any structure that makes his browser expressly or  
7 inherently dynamically loadable or executing. For instance, the browser may  
8 always be loaded. It is not inherent that a browser be dynamically loadable.

9 Moreover, Applicants' element (3) the Internet browser being dynamically  
10 loadable "when the tuner is tuned to a channel carrying an interactive video  
11 content program" is not expressly or inherently present in the system described in  
12 Throckmorton. Throckmorton describes no structure to load the browser when the  
13 tuner is tuned to an interactive video content program. As already described with  
14 reference to elements (1) and (2), the structure that Throckmorton does not  
15 expressly or inherently describe a processor that determines whether a video  
16 program is interactive, and does not describe a browser that is dynamically  
17 loadable. Throckmorton describes no structure to load the browser when the tuner  
18 is tuned to an interactive video content program, and could not because in the  
19 system described in Throckmorton, there is no determination of whether a  
20 program is interactive. The browser mentioned in Throckmorton for instance may  
21 always be in memory or may always be executing, or may be loadable and  
22 executing in response to some condition other than whether a tuner is tuned to an  
23 interactive channel. Throckmorton expressly states that the data accessed over the  
24 Internet is accessed upon "human" interface command, and specifically not upon  
25

1 tuning to an interactive program as recited by Applicants. For any of these  
2 reasons, Throckmorton does not inherently describe Applicant's element (3).

3 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
4 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
5 submit that claim 56 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
6 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
7 this reason, Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 56.

8  
9 **Claim 57**

10 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
11 claim 57 because claim 57 depends from claim 56. Claim 57 is allowable by  
12 virtue of its dependency on base claim 57.

13 Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not  
14 anticipate claim 57 because claim 57 includes other elements that are not  
15 described in Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants' claim 57  
16 recites the viewer of claim 56 comprising the following elements:

17  
18 (1) an electronic programming guide (EPG) stored in the memory  
19 and executable on the processor to organize programming  
20 information, (2) the EPG associating a target specification to a target  
21 resource with a video content program and (3) the Internet browser  
22 activating the target resource when the tuner is tuned to the video  
23 content program.  
24  
25

1 The Office Action contends that Throckmorton (col. 8 line 16 - col. 9 line  
2 15) inherently discloses Applicant's EPG as recited in claim 57, including the 3  
3 elements enumerated above. Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton  
4 does not inherently disclose these 3 elements.

5 The Office Action cites the section of Throckmorton (FIG. 4 and col. 8 line  
6 16-col. 9 line 15) cited above with respect to claim 56. As described with respect  
7 to claim 56, this cited section of Throckmorton states that upon operator (i.e.  
8 "human interface") command, the internet is accessed for data from remote  
9 computers sent to the "human interface" for presentation.

10 Applicants' element (1) an "EPG" to "organize programming information"  
11 is not expressly or inherently present in the system described in Throckmorton.  
12 Throckmorton does not state or describe the bases for accessing the internet for  
13 interactive data. Throckmorton describes that coupled computers are accessed  
14 upon "human interface" command. There is no indication that an EPG is used.  
15 Based upon the description in Throckmorton, Throckmorton could just as feasibly  
16 access coupled computers based on hand-written notations on a pad that the  
17 human operator reads and inputs, upon some static reference that is not  
18 specifically program dependent, or upon some data set that is transmitted to the  
19 system 34 but that is not program dependant.

20 Applicants' element (2) an "EPG associating a target specification to a  
21 target resource with a video content program EPG" is not expressly or inherently  
22 present in the system described in Throckmorton. Throckmorton does not  
23 describe an EPG, does not describe a structure to necessarily initialize an EPG  
24 with data, does not describe a structure to use an EPG, and does not describe a  
25 structure to organize an EPG. In the system described in Throckmorton, the data



1 accessed over the internet is referenced to the associated data (col. 9 line 1-15) and  
2 the associated data is input into receiver 36 concurrently with the video portion,  
3 thus obviating any necessity for an EPG. Throckmorton does not state or describe  
4 in any way that system 34 organizes program information. If in some way  
5 Throckmorton does organize program information, there are endless possibilities  
6 to organize the information, and it is not necessary (i.e. inherent) that  
7 Throckmorton do it by "associating a target specification to a target resource with  
8 a video content program EPG" as recited by Applicants.

9 Applicants' (3) "Internet browser activating the target resource when the  
10 tuner is tuned to the video content program" is not expressly or inherently present  
11 in the system described in Throckmorton. As described with reference to claim  
12 56, Throckmorton does not test whether the primary data stream is an interactive  
13 video program, or take any action dependent upon it having an associated data  
14 stream portion, or an interactive portion. Moreover, Throckmorton expressly  
15 states that data is accessed over the Internet upon "human interface" command,  
16 and not that a browser activates a target resource when a tuner is tuned to a video  
17 content program.

18 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
19 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
20 submit that claim 57 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
21 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
22 this reason, as well as by virtue of the dependency of claim 57 on base claim 56,  
23 the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 57.  
24  
25

1                   **Claim 61**

2                   The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
3 claim 61 because claim 61 includes two elements that are not described in  
4 Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants Claim 61 recites a  
5 computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for  
6 a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content  
7 program, comprising the following elements:

- 8
- 9                   (1) determining if a program is interactive compatible, where an  
10                  interactive compatible program is associated with target resources  
11                  containing data which supports interactive functionality, the target  
12                  resources being located by corresponding target specifications, and  
13                  (2) in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving  
14                  a target specification associated with the program and dynamically  
15                  launching an Internet browser to activate the target resource in  
16                  support of interactive functionality for the program.

17

18                  The Office Action contends that Throckmorton describes a method for  
19 transmitting primary data and associated data to a system 34 as described with  
20 reference to claim 56. The Office Action then comments that the elements of  
21 claim 61 are inherent.

22                  Applicants' element (1) "determining if a program is interactive  
23 compatible, where an interactive compatible program is associated with target  
24 resources containing data which supports interactive functionality, the target  
25 resources being located by corresponding target specifications" is not expressly or

1 inherently present in the system described in Throckmorton. First, Applicants  
2 respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not expressly or inherently describe  
3 determining whether a program being viewed is interactive compatible (upon  
4 tuning to a channel carrying the video content program). Described above with  
5 reference to claims 56 and 57, Throckmorton does not describe expressly or  
6 inherently determining if a program is interactive compatible. Instead,  
7 Throckmorton describes transmitting primary data and associated data, receiving  
8 and then separating the primary and associated data, and communicating with  
9 coupled computers upon "human interface" command without describing the  
10 bases for accessing the internet for data. Throckmorton provides no structure or  
11 method to determine if a program is interactive compatible, does not describe  
12 determining whether a program is interactive compatible (upon tuning to a channel  
13 carrying the video content program), and is not directed at determining whether a  
14 program is interactive compatible (because no actions are described in  
15 Throckmorton as dependant upon that determination). There is no reason that  
16 determining whether a program is interactive compatible (upon tuning to a channel  
17 carrying the video content program) is expressly or inherently present in the  
18 system described in Throckmorton.

19 Applicants' element (2) "in an event that the program is interactive  
20 compatible, retrieving a target specification associated with the program and  
21 dynamically launching an Internet browser to activate the target resource in  
22 support of interactive functionality for the program" As described above with  
23 reference to claim 56, Throckmorton does not expressly or inherently determine  
24 whether a program is interactive compatible. Moreover, an interactive compatible  
25 program is recited in claim 61 as being associated with target resources containing

1 data which supports interactive functionality, the target resources being located by  
2 corresponding target specifications. Throckmorton only describes that a "human"  
3 interface can command to receive data from other computer systems. Described  
4 with reference to claims 56 and 57, Throckmorton does not describe, expressly or  
5 inherently, a basis for accessing the internet, and could just as feasibly access  
6 coupled computers based on hand-written notations on a pad that the human  
7 operator reads and inputs, upon some static reference that is not specifically  
8 program dependent, or upon some data set that is transmitted to the system 34, but  
9 that is not associated with an interactive compatible program having target  
10 resources containing data which supports interactive functionality, the target  
11 resources being located by corresponding target specifications, as recited in claim  
12 61. There are endless possibilities. Throckmorton does not describe a structure or  
13 a method to determine whether a program is interactive compatible as recited in  
14 claim 61. Moreover, Throckmorton does not expressly or inherently describe a  
15 computer implemented retrieving of a target specification associated with a  
16 program if the program is interactive compatible. As already described,  
17 Throckmorton describes only a "human" interface to issue a command to receive  
18 data from other computer systems. Moreover, as described with reference to claim  
19 56, Throckmorton does not describe launching a browser. Moreover, as described  
20 with reference to claims 56 and 56, Throckmorton does not expressly or inherently  
21 describe interactive functionality for a program.

22 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
23 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
24 submit that claim 61 recites at least two elements that are not described expressly  
25

1 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
2 this reason, the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 61.

3  
4 **Claim 62**

5 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
6 claim 62 because claim 62 depends from claim 61. Claim 62 is allowable by  
7 virtue of its dependency on base claim 61.

8 Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not  
9 anticipate claim 62 because claim 62 includes at least three elements that are not  
10 described in Throckmorton expressly or inherently. Applicants' claim 62 recites  
11 the method of claim 61 comprising the following elements:

12  
13 (1) wherein the target specifications are correlated with the program  
14 in a program listing, and further comprising (2) checking the  
15 program listing to ascertain whether the program is interactive  
16 compatible and (3) determining that the program is interactive  
17 compatible by presence of a target specification being associated  
18 with the program in the program listing.

19  
20 The Office Action contends that Throckmorton discloses the  
21 Communication manager 66 receiving data from communication devices (col. 6  
22 line 60 - col. 7 line 12), real time trigger 76 accepting commands sent as part of  
23 the associated data to display a page without the user asking for it, and at any time  
24 the user may be browsing the data stored in local storage (col. 7 line 20 - col. 8  
25

1 line 15). The Office Action then comments that the elements of claim 62 are  
2 inherent.

3 Applicants' element (1) "wherein the target specifications are correlated  
4 with the program in a program listing" is not expressly or inherently present in the  
5 system described in Throckmorton. As described with reference to claims 56, 57,  
6 and 61 above, the Throckmorton video signal and the associated data signal are  
7 received as a combined common signal. The data from other computers, which is  
8 not interactive data, are commanded upon "human interface" without any basis  
9 described. There is no structure or method described in Throckmorton that is  
10 related to a program listing, or correlating a target specification with a program in  
11 a program listing. With regard to the cited section of Throckmorton, and as  
12 described with reference to claim 56, real time trigger 76 is coupled to the non-  
13 interactive associated data stream 64. It is un-related to interactive data. It is a  
14 structure for the associated data which is not retrieved from other sources, but is  
15 implicitly input into the receiver 36 along with the primary data.

16 Applicant's element (2) "checking the program listing to ascertain whether  
17 the program is interactive compatible" is not expressly or inherently present in the  
18 system described in Throckmorton. As described with reference to claims 56, 57,  
19 and 61, the system described in Throckmorton does not ascertain expressly or  
20 inherently whether a program is interactive compatible, so certainly does not  
21 expressly or inherently ascertain that a program is interactive compatible by  
22 checking a program listing. As described with reference to claim 61, there is no  
23 structure or method described in Throckmorton for utilizing a program listing.

24 Applicant's element (3) "determining that the program is interactive  
25 compatible by presence of a target specification being associated with the program

1 in the program listing” is not expressly or inherently present in the system  
2 described in Throckmorton. As described with reference to claims 56, 57, and 61,  
3 the system described in Throckmorton does not determine expressly or inherently  
4 whether a program is interactive compatible, and does not expressly or inherently  
5 determine that a program is interactive compatible by checking a program listing.  
6 There is no structure or method described in Throckmorton for utilizing a target  
7 specification.

8 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
9 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants’ respectfully  
10 submit that claim 62 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
11 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
12 this reason, as well as by virtue of the dependency of claim 62 on base claim 61,  
13 the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 62.

14  
15 **Claim 63**

16 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
17 claim 63 because claim 63 depends from claim 61. Claim 63 is allowable by  
18 virtue of its dependency on base claim 61.

19 Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not  
20 anticipate claim 63 because claim 63 includes at least one element that is not  
21 described in Throckmorton expressly or inherently. Applicants’ claim 63 recites a  
22 computer programmed to perform the steps recited in claim 61, that is not  
23 described expressly or inherently in Throckmorton.

24 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
25 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants’ respectfully

1 submit that at least two elements of claim 63 are not described expressly or  
2 inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
3 reason, the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 63.  
4

5 **Claim 64**

6 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
7 claim 64 because claim 64 includes at least three elements not described in  
8 Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 64 recites a  
9 computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for  
10 a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content  
11 program, comprising the following elements:  
12

13 (1) determining if a program is interactive compatible by checking a  
14 channel separate from said channel carrying the video content  
15 program for presence of the supplemental content, where an  
16 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources  
17 containing data which support interactive functionality in  
18 conjunction with the video content program, (2) the target resources  
19 being located by corresponding target specifications; and (3) in an  
20 event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
21 specification associated with the program and dynamically launching  
22 an Internet browser to activate the target resources in support of  
23 interactive functionality for the program.  
24  
25



1       The Office Action contends that claim 64 is inherently the method  
2 described in Throckmorton in Col. 8 line 15-Col. 9 line 15. The cited portion of  
3 Throckmorton describes a local data manager 84 connected to both the  
4 communications manager 66 and a "human interface" 88. The local data manager  
5 84 receives commands from the "human interface" to retrieve associated data from  
6 local storage 80 for presentation, and a browser "may be used to display data  
7 pages from the WWW" (col. 7 line 36-.line 44). Throckmorton describes that a  
8 remote data manager 92 receives commands from the "human interface" 88 to  
9 retrieve data from remote computers through communications channel 74 and send  
10 that data for presentation to the "human interface" 88. (col. 8 line 30-34). The  
11 "two-way communication channel allows a consumer to access online services"  
12 which may be web pages" (col. 9 line 1-4).

13       As described with reference to Claim 56, Throckmorton does not expressly  
14 or inherently determine whether a program is interactive compatible. As described  
15 with reference to claims 56, 57, 61, 62, 63. and 64 above, Throckmorton does not  
16 describe expressly or inherently the three elements above, particularly  
17 "determining if a program is interactive compatible by checking a channel  
18 separate from said channel carrying the video content program for presence of the  
19 supplemental content in conjunction with a being received program on said  
20 channel carrying the video content program," and "the target resources being  
21 located by corresponding target specifications," and "in an event that the program  
22 is interactive compatible, retrieving a target specification associated with the  
23 program and dynamically launching an Internet browser to activate the target  
24 resources in support of interactive functionality."  
25

1 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
2 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
3 submit that claim 64 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
4 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
5 this reason, the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 64.

6  
7 **Claim 65**

8 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
9 claim 65 because claim 65 includes at least three elements not described in  
10 Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 65 recites a  
11 computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for  
12 a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content  
13 program, comprising the following elements:

14  
15 (1) determining if a program is interactive compatible, where an  
16 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources  
17 containing data which support interactive functionality in  
18 conjunction with the interactive compatible program, the target  
19 resources being located by corresponding target specifications; (2)  
20 displaying an icon to visually inform the viewer that the program is  
21 interactive compatible; and (3) in an event that the program is  
22 interactive compatible, retrieving a target specification associated  
23 with the program and launching an Internet browser to activate the  
24 target resource in support of interactive functionality for the  
25 program.

1  
2 The Office Action contends that Throckmorton inherently describes  
3 elements (1) - (3) above. As described above with reference to claims 56, 57, and  
4 61-63, Throckmorton neither expressly or inherently describes determining if a  
5 program is interactive compatible, and in the event the program is interactive  
6 compatible, retrieving a target specification associated with the program and  
7 launching an Internet browser. Moreover, Applicant's element (2) "displaying an  
8 icon to visually inform the viewer that the program is interactive compatible" is  
9 not expressly or inherently present in Throckmorton. Throckmorton nowhere  
10 describes an icon or visually informing a viewer that a program is interactive  
11 compatible. As already described with reference to Claims 56, 57, and 61-63,  
12 Throckmorton describes a system having associated data and not interactive  
13 compatible data.

14 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
15 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
16 submit that claim 65 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
17 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
18 this reason, the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 65.

19  
20 **Claim 66**

21 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
22 claim 66 because claim 66 includes at least five elements not described in  
23 Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 66 recites a  
24 computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for  
25

1 a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content  
2 program, comprising the following elements:

3  
4 (1) determining if a program is interactive compatible, where an  
5 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources  
6 containing data which supports interactive functionality in  
7 conjunction with the interactive compatible program, (2) the target  
8 resources being located by corresponding target specifications; (3)  
9 displaying the interactive supplement content in response to the  
10 viewer activating an icon; and (4) in an event that the program is  
11 interactive compatible, retrieving a target specification associated  
12 with the program and (5) launching an Internet browser to activate  
13 the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the  
14 program.

15  
16 The Office Action contends that for the same reasons given with respect to  
17 claim 65, Throckmorton inherently describes claim 66. The Office Action further  
18 contends that “the system actually connects to and retrieves the referenced  
19 information from the appropriate source. As a result, the interactive supplemental  
20 content is displayed in response to the viewer activating the icon.” (Col. 9 line 12-  
21 14).

22 Applicants respectfully submit that this passage of Throckmorton cited in  
23 the Office Action refers to associated data possibly having references such as a  
24 URL for retrieving the referenced information on the internet. Thus by clicking  
25

1 the reference, the system can connect to the reference. There is no reference here  
2 or any where else in Throckmorton to an icon or to a viewer activating an icon.

3 As described above with reference to claims 56, 57, and 61-65,  
4 Throckmorton neither expressly or inherently describes elements (1)-(5) including  
5 determining if a program is interactive compatible; target resources being located  
6 by corresponding target specifications; displaying an icon (in order for a viewer to  
7 activate the icon); in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving  
8 a target specification associated with the program; and launching an Internet  
9 browser to activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for  
10 the program if a program is interactive compatible as recited by Applicants in  
11 claim 66.

12 Moreover, Applicant's element (2) "displaying the interactive supplement  
13 content in response to the viewer activating the icon" is not expressly or inherently  
14 described in Throckmorton. As described with reference to claim 65,  
15 Throckmorton does not display an icon. Throckmorton does not visually inform  
16 the viewer that the program is interactive compatible, or visually inform the  
17 viewer that the program is interactive by displaying an icon. Throckmorton does  
18 not display interactive content, but displays just associated data and data from  
19 remote computers that is not expressly or inherently interactive compatible.  
20 Throckmorton as described with reference to claim 57, does not give any basis for  
21 displaying data from remote computers other than it is done by "human interface."

22 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
23 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
24 submit that claim 66 recites at least five elements that are not described expressly  
25

1 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
2 this reason, the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 66.

3  
4 **Claim 67**

5 The Applicants respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate  
6 claim 67 because claim 67 includes at least five elements not described in  
7 Throckmorton either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 67 recites a  
8 computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for  
9 a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content  
10 program, comprising the following elements:

11  
12 (1) determining if a program is interactive compatible, where an  
13 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources  
14 containing data which support interactive functionality in  
15 conjunction with the interactive compatible program, (2) the target  
16 resources being located by corresponding target specifications; (3) in  
17 an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a  
18 target specification associated with the program and (4) launching an  
19 Internet browser to activate the target resource in support of  
20 interactive functionality for the program; and (5) automatically  
21 displaying the interactive supplement content together with the  
22 program.

1 The Office action refers to the associated data being displayed in  
2 Throckmorton. (Col. 7 line 21-29), and contends that the interactive supplemental  
3 content is automatically displayed together with the program.

4 As described with reference to claims 56, 57, and 61-66, Throckmorton  
5 does not expressly or inherently describe elements (1)-(4). Moreover, Applicants  
6 respectfully submit that Throckmorton does not expressly or inherently describe  
7 Applicants' element (5) "automatically displaying the interactive supplement  
8 content together with the program." Throckmorton does not describe "interactive  
9 supplemental content" but instead describes a concurrently received signal that is  
10 termed "associated data." Throckmorton does not expressly or inherently describe  
11 receiving interactive supplement content and automatically displaying the  
12 interactive supplement content together with the program.

13 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
14 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
15 submit that claim 67 recites at least five elements that are not described expressly  
16 or inherently in Throckmorton in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For  
17 this reason, the Applicants submit that Throckmorton does not anticipate claim 67.

18  
19 **THE HARRISON 35 U.S.C. §102(e) REJECTION**

20 **Claim 56**

21 The Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim  
22 56 because claim 56 includes at least three elements not described in Harrison  
23 either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 56 recites a viewer computing  
24 unit comprising the elements recited above with reference to Throckmorton.

1 The Office Action contends that Harrison (col. 2 line 53 - col. 3 line 34)  
2 inherently discloses Applicant's viewer computing unit as recited in claim 56. To  
3 establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing  
4 descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described. Furthermore,  
5 inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. MPEP §2112  
6 from *In re Robertson*, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-52 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Applicants  
7 respectfully submit that Harrison does not inherently disclose Applicants' viewer  
8 computing unit as recited in claim 56.

9 Harrison (col. 2 line 53 - col. 3 line 34) provides a summary of a system in  
10 which a "chat" signal is inserted into a television program signal (col. 2 line 35-  
11 38), and received and separated. The television program is displayed in one  
12 window, the chat encoded data is displayed in another window (col. 2 line 60-65).  
13 A telephone channel is also provided that allows connection to on-line chatting  
14 triggered by an input at a keyboard (col. 3 line 2-5). Thus, a consumer can either  
15 observe someone else's chat transmitted with the television signal in the chat  
16 window, or alternatively the consumers own chat if the keyboard is exercised (col.  
17 3 line 12-27). Harrison FIG. 2 shows the chat data coming in as associated data  
18 with a TV program 202, then being separated by the decoder 204 for separate  
19 viewing on the chat room window 226. However, alternatively the signal from an  
20 actual chat the user is participating in can be input from the selection logic 224 to  
21 be displayed, rather the encoded associated data (col. 3 line 53 - col. 6 line 10 or  
22 col. 6 Line 15 - Col. 6 line 67).

23 Applicants' element (1) a processor "programmed to determine whether the  
24 video content programs are interactive" is not expressly or inherently present in  
25 the system described in Harrison. Harrison in no way addresses interactive



1 television. There is not a structure described in Harrison expressly or inherently to  
2 determine whether a video program is interactive. The structure described in  
3 Harrison instead assumes that a video signal has an associated chat component  
4 unrelated to interactive television, or even not necessarily related in any way to the  
5 television program, that is input with the video signal. The real-time chat data  
6 input through the selection logic 224 is not necessarily related to the television  
7 program but is merely displayed at the same time as a possibly being displayed  
8 television program, but in a different window.

9 Applicants' element (2) "Internet browser that is stored in memory, and  
10 dynamically loadable for execution on the processor" is not expressly or  
11 inherently present in the system described in Harrison. Harrison does not use the  
12 term "browser" anywhere, and uses the term internet at col. 3 line 17-22 to  
13 specifically teach away from this element by stating that "an advantage of this  
14 invention is that consumers do not have to be connected to the internet or on-line  
15 service." Harrison further does not describe any structure that makes a browser  
16 expressly or inherently dynamically loadable or executing.

17 Moreover, Applicants' element (3) the Internet browser being dynamically  
18 loadable "when the tuner is tuned to a channel carrying an interactive video  
19 content program" is not expressly or inherently present in the system described in  
20 Harrison. As already described with reference to elements (1) and (2), the  
21 structure that Harrison describes does not expressly or inherently describe a  
22 processor that determines whether a video program is interactive, and does not  
23 describe a browser that is dynamically loadable.

24 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
25 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully

1 submit that claim 56 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
2 or inherently in Harrison in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
3 reason, the Applicants submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim 56.  
4

5 **Claim 61**

6 The Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim  
7 61 because claim 61 includes two elements that are not described in Harrison  
8 either expressly or inherently. Applicants Claim 61 recites a computer-  
9 implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video  
10 content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program,  
11 comprising the elements recited above with reference to Throckmorton.

12 The Office Action contends that the limitations of claim 61 are analyzed  
13 with reference to claim 56. As described with reference to claim 56, Harrison  
14 neither expressly or inherently describes the elements of claim 56. Moreover,  
15 Harrison provides not structure for retrieving any kind of data as recited in  
16 element (2). Instead Harrison merely displays data physically associated with the  
17 television signal, or instead, chat data if the consumer is chatting. Nothing is  
18 retrieved by any structure described in Harrison.

19 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
20 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
21 submit that claim 61 recites at least two elements that are not described expressly  
22 or inherently in Harrison in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
23 reason, the Applicants submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim 61.  
24  
25

1        **Claim 64**

2        The Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim  
3        64 because claim 64 includes at least three elements not described in Harrison  
4        either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 64 recites a computer-  
5        implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video  
6        content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program,  
7        comprising the elements recited above with reference to Throckmorton.

8        The Office Action contends that the limitations of claim 61 are analyzed  
9        with reference to claim 56. As described with reference to claim 56, Harrison  
10       neither expressly or inherently describes the elements of claim 56. Moreover,  
11       claim 64 further recites a specific method for determining if a program is  
12       interactive compatible including element (1) determining if a program is  
13       interactive compatible by checking a channel separate from said channel carrying  
14       the video content program for presence of the supplemental content in conjunction  
15       with a being received program on said channel carrying the video content  
16       program, where an interactive compatible program is associated with target  
17       resources containing data which support interactive functionality in conjunction  
18       with the video content program, element (2) the target resources being located by  
19       corresponding target specifications; and element (3) retrieving a target  
20       specification associated with the program and dynamically launching an Internet  
21       browser to activate the target resources. Even if Harrison were somehow to  
22       inherently describe the elements of claim 61 (which Applicants traverse) Harrison  
23       neither explicitly nor inherently provides a structure or a method for any of the  
24       elements further recited in claim 64 which the Office Action does not address.  
25       Interactive compatibility is not determined in Harrison, target resources are not

1 located in Harrison, and target data associated with the program is not retrieved in  
2 Harrison. Harrison merely displays data physically associated with the television  
3 signal, or instead, chat data if the consumer is chatting.

4 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
5 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
6 submit that claim 64 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
7 or inherently in Harrison in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
8 reason, the Applicants submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim 64.

9  
10 **Claim 65**

11 The Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim  
12 65 because claim 65 includes at least three elements not described in Harrison  
13 either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 65 recites a computer-  
14 implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video  
15 content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program,  
16 comprising the elements recited above with reference to Throckmorton.

17 The Office Action contends that Harrison teaches a method as discussed in  
18 the rejection of claim 64. As described with reference to claim 64, Harrison  
19 neither expressly or inherently describes the elements of claim 64. Moreover,  
20 claim 65 further recites at least the element (2) displaying an icon to visually  
21 inform the viewer that the program is interactive compatible. Even if Harrison  
22 were somehow to inherently describe the elements of claim 64 (which Applicants  
23 traverse) Harrison neither explicitly nor inherently provides a structure or a  
24 method for element (2). The Office Action contends that 'the chat window reads  
25 on the 'icon'.' The Applicants traverse. The icon is recited by Applicants for

1 indicating that a program is interactive compatible. The chat window in Harrison  
2 does not indicate whether or not a television program is interactive compatible.  
3 The chat window in Harrison displays the content of a chat, which is even not  
4 necessarily related to the contents of the television program.

5 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
6 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
7 submit that claim 65 recites at least three elements that are not described expressly  
8 or inherently in Harrison in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
9 reason, the Applicants submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim 65.

#### 11 **Claim 66**

12 The Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim  
13 66 because claim 66 includes at least five elements not described in Throckmorton  
14 either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 66 recites a computer-  
15 implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video  
16 content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program,  
17 comprising the elements recited above with reference to Throckmorton.

18 The Office Action contends that Harrison teaches a method as discussed in  
19 the rejection of claim 65. As described with reference to claim 65, Harrison  
20 neither expressly or inherently describes the elements of claim 65. Moreover,  
21 claim 66 further recites at least the element (3) "displaying the interactive  
22 supplement content in response to the viewer activating an icon." The Office  
23 Action contends that Harrison inherently comprises element (3) because the  
24 "computer is automatically makes a connection to the on-line service if a user  
25 chooses ... typing text at the computer keyboard." The Applicants traverse.

1 Applicants respectfully submit that if a viewer types at the keyboard, the viewer is  
2 typing "chat" data for direct display in the chat window and that is not interactive  
3 supplemental television content. At any rate, a user typing at the keyboard is not  
4 inherently the same as a user activating an icon.

5 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
6 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
7 submit that claim 66 recites at least five elements that are not described expressly  
8 or inherently in Harrison in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
9 reason, the Applicants submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim 65.

#### 11 Claim 67

12 The Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim  
13 67 because claim 67 includes at least five elements not described in Harrison  
14 either expressly or inherently. Applicants' Claim 67 recites a computer-  
15 implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video  
16 content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program,  
17 comprising the elements recited above with reference to Throckmorton.

18 The Office Action contends that Harrison teaches a method as discussed in  
19 the rejection of claim 65. As described with reference to claim 65, Harrison  
20 neither expressly or inherently describes the elements of claim 65. Moreover,  
21 claim 67 further recites at least the element (4) "launching an Internet browser to  
22 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the program"  
23 and (5) "automatically displaying the interactive supplement content together with  
24 the program" The Office Action contends that Harrison inherently comprises  
25 element (5) because the viewers who do not desire to participate ... in a chat can

1 view the contents of the chat by watching associated data transmitted with the  
2 television signal. Applicants traverse. Applicants respectfully submit that  
3 Harrison is describing chat data not necessarily related to the television program  
4 which is not the interactive supplement content recited by the Applicants.

5 In order to support a §102 rejection, a reference must describe every  
6 element of a claim, in the exact manner claimed. The Applicants' respectfully  
7 submit that claim 67 recites at least five elements that are not described expressly  
8 or inherently in Harrison in the exact manner claimed by Applicants. For this  
9 reason, the Applicants submit that Harrison does not anticipate claim 67.

#### 10 CONCLUSION

11 Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of these  
12 claims in view of the above amendments and remarks. Applicants respectfully  
13 submit that Throckmorton and Harrison do not anticipate claims 56, 57, and 61-  
14 67, and that claims 56, 57, and 61-67 should therefore be allowed. Should any  
15 matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully  
16 requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such  
17 outstanding matter.

18  
19 Respectfully Submitted,  
20 LEE & HAYES PLLC  
21 421 W RIVERSIDE AVE SUITE 500  
22 SPOKANE, WA 99201

23 Date: Apr 9, 2003

24 Kenneth Paley  
25 Kenneth Paley  
Reg. No. 38,989  
(509) 324-9256 x217

ATTACHMENT

In accordance with CFR § 1.121, a marked-up version of amended claims 61, and 64-67 showing all changes relative to the previous version of those claims is given below:

61. (Twice Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program, comprising the following steps:

determining if a[the] program is interactive compatible, where an interactive compatible program is associated with target resources containing data which supports interactive functionality[ in conjunction with the program], the target resources being located by corresponding target specifications; and

in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target specification associated with the program and dynamically launching an Internet browser to activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the program.

64. (Twice Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the video content program, comprising the following steps:

determining if a[the] program is interactive compatible by checking a channel separate from said [program ]channel for presence of the supplemental content[ in conjunction with the program being received on said program channel], where an interactive compatible program is associated with target resources containing data which support interactive functionality in conjunction with the



1 video content program, the target resources being located by corresponding target  
2 specifications; and

3 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
4 specification associated with the program and dynamically launching an Internet  
5 browser to activate the target resources in support of interactive functionality for  
6 the program.

7  
8 65. (Twice Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating  
9 interactive supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a  
10 channel carrying the video content program, comprising the following steps:

11 determining if a[the] program is interactive compatible, where an  
12 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources containing data  
13 which support interactive functionality in conjunction with the interactive  
14 compatible program, the target resources being located by corresponding target  
15 specifications;

16 displaying an icon to visually inform the viewer that the program is  
17 interactive compatible; and

18 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
19 specification associated with the program and launching an Internet browser to  
20 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the program.

21  
22 66. (Twice Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating  
23 interactive supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a  
24 channel carrying the video content program, comprising the following steps:

1 determining if a[the] program is interactive compatible, where an  
2 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources containing data  
3 which supports interactive functionality in conjunction with the interactive  
4 compatible program, the target resources being located by corresponding target  
5 specifications;

6 displaying the interactive supplement content in response to the viewer  
7 activating an[the] icon; and

8 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
9 specification associated with the program and launching an Internet browser to  
10 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the program.

11  
12 67. (Twice Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating  
13 interactive supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a  
14 channel carrying the video content program, comprising the following steps:

15 determining if a[the] program is interactive compatible, where an  
16 interactive compatible program is associated with target resources containing data  
17 which support interactive functionality in conjunction with the interactive  
18 compatible program, the target resources being located by corresponding target  
19 specifications;

20 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
21 specification associated with the program and launching an Internet browser to  
22 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the program;  
23 and

24 automatically displaying the interactive supplement content together with  
25 the [interactive compatible ]program.